

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in reply to the outstanding Office Action dated February 7, 2008. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 35 currently stand rejected. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21 to more particularly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-7, 10-22 and 25-38 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,183, hereinafter “Satran”) in view of Stapleton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,875, hereinafter “Stapleton”) and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,285, hereinafter “Lee”). Claims 8, 9, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran in view of Stapleton and further in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,983, hereinafter “Haggerty”). Claims 5, 14, 19, 29, 32-34 and 36-38 were canceled, without prejudice, in a prior response and thus the rejections of these claims remain moot. With respect to the remaining rejected claims, Applicants remarks follow.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, tables of addresses of receivers belonging to a multicast group in a packet-switched network are stored and specific parameters of the receivers are stored in a table, wherein the specific parameters comprise parameters which are dependent on receiver conditions. Independent claim 1 also recites addresses of receivers of the multicast group indicated by the multicast address are determined by searching the tables based on the multicast address and that a receiver list is prepared from the addresses of the receivers. Additionally, the specific parameters of the receivers of the multicast group are determined by searching the table in which the specific parameters for each receiver of the receiver list are stored and the receiver list and the specific parameters per address of the receiver list are supplied to the routing unit. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited

references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited features.

Stapleton fails to provide any disclosure regarding determining specific parameters of receivers by searching a table. Satran is not concerned with tables at all. Furthermore, according to Satran, a receiver itself determines whether a packet should be received. Meanwhile, Lee is directed to a multicasting apparatus that broadcasts messages to at least some clients in a computing network environment having a plurality of clients and at least one host connected to the clients via a gateway device. A multicast routing table is created for registering any host and clients requesting registration. The table of Lee will include one entry per host/client and includes the relevant information of each host/client. According to Lee, a connectivity platform is used for controlling all communications so that all information packets are first received by the platform. Upon the receipt of a packet, the table is searched and, if a match is found, the packet will be routed using the entry information; otherwise, the packet will be dropped as described, for example, in the Abstract of Lee.

FIG. 5 of Lee shows a plurality of clients C1501, C2502, C3503 and C4504, which are processing communications with at least one host 500 via a LAN 550. The host(s) comprises a plurality of servers and host images. An OSA adapter is also shown at element 560 coupled to the LAN. By the use of a SET IPM (IP Multicast) command, at initialization time, hosts images present in the computing network are identified and registered. A corresponding table is provided for storing the characteristics of client, host images including the address, the protocol used and the LAN MAC header information and IP address. The table is then kept dynamically so that with the addition and registration of each new client host image, the table is updated. When a multicast communication is made, the table will be searched for a matching entry. When the corresponding entry is made, the message is routed to all host images which have registered with the corresponding IP multicast address (e.g., via SETIPM command). However, if no corresponding match is made in the table, the packet is dropped and resources are freed (col. 6, lines 40-61 of Lee). Thus, the table of Lee stores addresses of receivers registered for multicasting.

However, Lee fails to teach or suggest that specific parameters of receivers of a multicast group, wherein the specific parameters comprise parameters which are dependent on receiver conditions, are determined by searching a table in which the specific parameters for each receiver of a receiver list prepared from the addresses of the receivers are stored. Thus, Lee fails to teach or suggest specific parameters of the receivers are stored in a table, wherein the specific parameters comprise parameters which are dependent on receiver conditions. Additionally, Lee fails to teach or suggest that the specific parameters of the receivers of the multicast group are determined by searching the table in which the specific parameters for each receiver of the receiver list are stored and the receiver list and the specific parameters per address of the receiver list are supplied to the routing unit as provided in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, since Lee, Stapleton and Satran fail to teach or suggest specific parameters of the receivers are stored in a table, wherein the specific parameters comprise parameters which are dependent on receiver conditions and that the specific parameters of the receivers of the multicast group are determined by searching the table in which the specific parameters for each receiver of the receiver list are stored and the receiver list and the specific parameters per address of the receiver list are supplied to the routing unit as provided in independent claim 1, any combination of Lee, Stapleton and Satran also fails to teach or suggest the above recited features of independent claim 1.

Haggerty fails to cure the above described deficiencies of Lee, Satran and Stapleton and is not cited as such. Since none of the cited references alone teach or suggest specific parameters of the receivers are stored in a table, wherein the specific parameters comprise parameters which are dependent on receiver conditions and that the specific parameters of the receivers of the multicast group are determined by searching the table in which the specific parameters for each receiver of the receiver list are stored and the receiver list and the specific parameters per address of the receiver list are supplied to the routing unit as provided in independent claim 1, any combination of the cited references likewise fails to render independent claim 1 obvious for at least the same reasons described above. Independent claims 6, 15 and 21 each include similar recitations to those described above in reference to independent claim 1. Thus, independent claims 6, 15 and 21 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 1.

Appl. No.: 10/049,590
Amtd. Dated May 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of 02/07/2008

Claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, 31 and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from a respective one of independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21, and as such, include all the recitations of their respective independent claims. The dependent claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, 31 and 35 are therefore patentably distinct from the cited references, individually or in combination, for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21.

Accordingly, for all the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 35 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/049,590
Amtd. Dated May 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of 02/07/2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 1, 2008.

LEGAL02/30788430v1